DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 324 378 UD 027 617

AUTHOR	Mei, Dolores M.; And Others
TITLE	City-As-School High School National Diffusion Network Developer/Demonstrator Project. End-of-Year Report, 1988-89. Evaluation Section Report. OREA Report.
INSTITUTION	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY. Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment.
PUB DATE	Jul 90
NOTE	28p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment, New York City Board of Education, 110 Livingston Street, Room 728, Brooklyn, NY 11201.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Demonstration Programs; *High Risk Students; Nontraditional Education; *Program Implementation; School Community Programs; *School Community Relationship; Secondary Education; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*City as School Program; National Diffusion Network Programs; *New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

City-as-School (CAS) is an alternative high school linking students to various out-of-school learning experiences throughout New York City. In 1985, CAS was awarded a National Diffusion Network (NDN) 4-year replication grant to disseminate the model to other schools and districts throughout the country. During 1988/89, its fourth year of implementation, CAS/NDN sought to replicate its model at 12 sites in different parts of the country, focusing special attention on at-risk students. Objectives included follow-up activities at the sites, development of materials for in-service teacher education, and modified "turn-key" training of replicator staff to become disseminators themselves. This evaluation found that the project's ongoing outreach efforts, focus on at-risk students, and in-service training objectives were achieved. The remaining objectives were only partially met due to limitations of time and resources. The following recommendations for improvement are suggested: (1) develop a plan for monitoring the progress of replicators at each site; (2) develop assessment measures based on student behavior, such as credits earned and attendance; (3) continue efforts to develop new disseminators in a large number of states and a higher number of inner-city schools; (4) attract more ninth- and tenth-grade students to the program; and (5) continue to update the program and develop financial independence. (FMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

OREA Report

EVALUATION SECTION REPORT

CITY-AS-SCHOOL HIGH SCHOOL
NATIONAL DIFFUSION NETWORK
DEVELOPER/DEMONSTRATOR PROJECT
END-OF-YEAR-REPORT

1988-89

Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment
New York City Board of Education
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment
Robert Tobias, Director
John E. Schoener, Chief Administrator

July 1990

EVALUATION SECTION REPORT

CITY-AS-SCHOOL HIGH SCHOOL
NATIONAL DIFFUSION NETWORK
DEVELOPER/DEMONSTRATOR PROJECT
END-OF-YEAR-REPORT

1988-89

Prepared by the OREA
High School Evaluation Unit

Dolores M. Mei
Evaluation Manager

Basima Ahed
Barry Gold
Evaluation Consultants

New York City Public School
Division of Strategic Planning/Research and Development
Robin Willner, Executive Director

NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Gwendolyn C. Baker
President

Irene H. Impellizzeri
Vice President

Carol A. Gresser
Westina L. Matthews
Michael J. Petrides
Luis O. Reyes
Ninfa Segarra
Members

Joseph A. Fernandez
Chancellor

It is the policy of the New York City Board of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, age, handicapping condition, marital status, sexual orientation, or sex in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, as required by law. Any person who believes he or she has been discriminated against should contact his or her Local Equal Opportunity Coordinator. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws may also be directed to Mercedes A. Nesfeld, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York 11201, or to the Director, Office for Civil Rights, United States Department of Education, 26 Federal Plaza, Room 33-130, New York, New York 10278.

7/3/90

SUMMARY

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

City-as-School (C.A.S) is an alternative high school linking students to various out-of-school learning experiences throughout New York City. In 1985, C.A.S. was awarded a National Diffusion Network (N.D.N.) four-year replication grant by the U.S. department of Education. The award is given to exemplary educational programs to enable them to disseminate their model to other interested schools and districts throughout the country. The 1988-89 school year represented C.A.S.'s fourth year of replication activities under N.D.N. funding.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

During the fourth year of implementation, C.A.S./N.D.N. sought to replicate its model at 12 sites in different parts of the country, where the focus would be on giving special attention to at-risk students. Fourth year objectives also included follow-up activities at the sites, and developing materials to aid in effective in-service training with particular emphasis on curriculum development.

Last year, the project objective of requiring C.A.S. to train replicator staff to themselves become disseminators was deemed by the project director to be overly ambitious. In 1988-89, the C.A.S./N.D.N. team decided that a scaled-down version of that objective was more appropriate.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The C.A.S./N.D.N. projects ongoing outreach efforts, at-risk students focus, and in-service training objectives were achieved. The objectives that the project only partially met were due largely to limitations of time and resources, as was the case with monitoring site visits and follow-up support, and even a scaled-down version of turn-key training.

A comprehensive demonstration manual was put into use this year. It provides technical and systematic assistance to replicating sites. As a result, disseminators should have a clearer understanding of the C.A.S. model.

Fourth-year activities and changes reflected a continually increasing knowledge of the needs and priorities of the project. A more effective and comprehensive view of C.A.S. has been developed, and the project is beginning to generate income of its own.

The following recommendations are made based on the fourth-year evaluation findings:

- C.A.S. should attempt to develop a monitoring plan for assessing the progress of all current replicators. Team members should specifically identify strengths and weaknesses of dissemination efforts in each school and make the results public and accessible.

- C.A.S. needs to find a method and create a form that more meaningfully conveys its effectiveness. Changed behavior, particularly as expressed in increased credits earned toward a diploma and in increased number of days of attendance be the appropriate focus.

- C.A.S. should continue efforts to make a large number of states and a higher number of inner-city school districts priorities in efforts to develop new disseminators; they should also continue to look at the potential of private schools as well.

- C.A.S. needs to look more sharply at ways to attract students in the ninth and tenth grades.

- As was done this year, C.A.S. should continue to update the program to offer a more effective and comprehensive view of itself, and to enhance its efficiency. C.A.S. should also continue to think of new ways to generate its own income.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Introduction	1
	Program Background	1
	Program Objectives	2
	Evaluation Methodology	3
	Scope of this Report	3
II.	Project Organization and Implementation	4
	Awareness Activities	4
	Selection	7
	Training	9
III.	Program Changes For 1988-89	12
	A more Realistic Concept of C.A.S.	12
	C.A.S. as a Potential Comprehensive High School	13
	Revised Role and Function of Staff	14
	Generating Income	14
	Turn-Key Training	15
IV.	OUTCOMES	16
	Selecting New Sites for Replication	16
	Special Attention to At-Risk Students	16
	Materials to Aid In-Service Training	17
	Monitoring Site Visits and Follow-Up Support	18
	Turn-Key Training	19
V.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	20

I. INTRODUCTION

PROGRAM BACKGROUND

City-as-School (C.A.S.) is a New York City Board of Education Alternative High school that was founded in 1972. The primary curricular objective is to have students who are unsuccessful in regular high schools learn by working in the New York City Community and still fulfill the requirements for a high school diploma. C.A.S.'s philosophy is that closely supervised field work combined with a small body of in-house classes for enrichment and remediation provide a foundation for combining the world of experience with the world of learning. This creates a school that is more relevant for students who need or want to learn differently.

Central to the C.A.S. program is the Learning Experience Activity Package (LEAP) whereby field-site resources such as businesses and civic, cultural, and governmental institutions are gathered and compiled into academic theme categories with a description of each activity and the requirements for credit listed for each resource in the school catalogue. Each LEAP has one C.A.S. staff member assigned as Resource coordinator (RC) who is responsible for monitoring and evaluating the student's progress. In addition, students are directly supervised by one representative of the field site who also functions as liaison to the school. Students who successfully complete the requirements of each LEAP are granted credit toward a high school diploma.

All high school students are eligible to transfer to City-

as-School. The intake data on transferees, however, demonstrates that the school is most likely to attract those whose needs and learning styles have not been satisfied by traditional high schools. A majority of incoming students have been truants, dropouts, or at risk of dropping out.

In 1977 C.A.S. won a Title IV-C Validation Grant as a "model of excellence" for its innovative and effective approach to the problem of high school attrition. As a result of the validation, C.A.S. also won a demonstration grant to promote awareness of, and to replicate its model in various school districts across New York State. In 1983 the program was validated by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (J.D.R.P.) for both dropout prevention and vocational education. This led to awards of National Diffusion Network (N.D.N.) replication grants for 1985-86 and 1986-87. The grant was extended for 1987-88 and 1988-89.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

Fourth-year implementation objectives for the replication project based on this year's program goals and subsequent discussions with the project director were:

- To replicate the C.A.S. model at 12 sites in different parts of the country
- At the replication sites to give special attention to at-risk students;

- To develop materials to aid in effective in-service training, with particular emphasis on curriculum development;
- To Conduct monitoring site visits and provide follow-up support for all replicating schools; and
- To offer a scaled-down version from last year of turn-key* training.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

OREA examined the implementation process in order to determine the extent to which each of the objectives was attained and to identify areas where changes in the replication process would enhance the quality of the program. OREA gathered information from written logs, reports, and reaction sheets assembled or prepared by the staff and from a personal interview with the project director.

SCOPE OF THIS REPORT

In Chapter II, the organization and implementation of the project is presented. Chapter III gives details on program changes for 1988-89. The achievement of project objectives is assessed in Chapter IV, and conclusions and recommendations are offered in Chapter V.

---

* A turn-key site is one whose staff are trained to replicate the model. Those staff members subsequently receive additional training to prepare them to serve as trainers in other replicating districts.

II. PROJECT ORGANIZATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

C.A.S. replication staff included a full-time director who was responsible for all administrative decisions affecting the project. She corresponded with potential replicators and represented the project at National Diffusion Network conferences. This year, four C.A.S. faculty members participated in the demonstration/replication process as field-site trainers and liaisons to identified districts. Two of these trainers left the program mid-year. Because of the development and evolution of the project over four years, individual members of the C.A.S. replication team were more closely identified with ongoing training and monitoring efforts in specific geographic areas than they had been in the past. In addition, the principal and assistant principal functioned as part of the replication team, conducting awareness sessions and using their contacts to identify potential replicators.

AWARENESS ACTIVITIES

In 1985-86, the first year of the replication project, there was no full-time director and all staff members involved in awareness activities were given release-time from other responsibilities at C.A.S. to facilitate outreach efforts. In 1986-87, a full-time director was hired and she was given primary responsibility for initiating and developing all awareness presentations. Initial sessions designed to introduce the C.A.S. model to potential replicators were virtually always scheduled

and conducted by the director.

In 1987-88 and 1988-89, C.A.S. awareness sessions were more likely to be given by other team members than in 1986-87, although the director was still responsible for the coordination and selection of conferences where these presentations were given. Awareness activities were often conducted by C.A.S. staff familiar with a given geographic area because of past presentations in that region.

Initial awareness sessions were optimally two-hours long and included a question and answer period. The goal of these sessions was to introduce potential replicators to the C.A.S. program model and to outline the school's basic philosophy, curriculum, and objectives. Everyone there was given a packet of program-related materials. Those schools or state facilitators interested in secondary awareness sessions called or wrote the director; she acted on each response. A contact file was maintained on all districts that indicated any degree of interest in C.A.S.

The C.A.S./N.D.N. Project Director arranged to conduct a more detailed secondary awareness session with those who expressed interest in potential replication. These secondary awareness sessions were optimally five hours long. Occasionally, the director rejected a request for a secondary awareness session because she believed that the school personnel lacked a serious understanding of the scope of the replication process. Staff presented the time frame for both training and replication in a

telephone conversation to potential adopters before making a trip to the site. The director stated that because of the continuity of the replication project and because a greater number of state N.D.N. facilitators were aware of C.A.S.'s goals and objectives, it was easier for information on the program to become disseminated to more school districts during the 1988-89 year. Also because C.A.S. had a three-year "track record," potential replicators had a greater understanding of the overall replication process from start to finish. In addition, according to the director, the fourth year of the N.D.N. contract meant that the C.A.S. team had a clearer understanding of the most important themes to stress during awareness presentations. Thus, it was possible for individual C.A.S. staff members to be given more autonomy in planning these sessions. In all, there were 28 awareness sessions conducted this year.

As replication efforts have progressed and the dissemination process has become more established and developed, C.A.S. has begun to look for new ways to expand. One way has been to look more to inner-city neighborhoods for potential replicator sites. The director stated that it was a priority for C.A.S. to disseminate the model to regions and populations that have been underrepresented in alternative programs of this kind in the past. Another method for expansion has been to look into the possibility of replicating C.A.S. at private schools. This year, the newly-funded Private School Facilatator sent out initial and secondary awareness materials. In addition, C.A.S. would like to

find ways to attract more students from the ninth and tenth grades at all sites. The director feels there is a lot of interest being generated in these grades.

Continuing the process that had been initiated during the 1986-87 year, the director reported that C.A.S./N.D.N. restricted the bulk of its awareness presentations to alternative school, N.D.N., and state governors' conferences to which C.A.S. had been invited. Previously, awareness presentations had been given at generic educational conferences where experience proved that interest in the C.A.S. model was limited. C.A.S. continued its efforts to begin dissemination activities with an audience of already interested people and educational programs so that staff time could be used efficiently. The staff also sought to create awareness through articles published in professional journals and film and video presentations.

State N.D.N. facilitators have been instrumental to the C.A.S. team in developing new sites for potential replication efforts. Interested facilitators were targeted by the director at the National N.D.N. conference.

SELECTION

The director stated that in order for a site to be a successful replicator it needed to: identify a resource coordinator or someone functioning in that capacity, develop a curriculum that utilized field placements in the community and design a student advising system that enhanced the learning that takes place in the field, and develop specialized courses that

cannot be met through the field placements (remedial classes, physical education, state requirements). Replicators also had to possess a strong interest and adequate resources for implementation.

Project staff surmised each site's interest levels from the initiative taken in following up on the initial awareness materials. Those that issued invitations asking project staff to come for a personal presentation and made key staff members available were judged to be sufficiently interested.

According to the project director there was no limit to the number of states that could have districts serve as replicators. The two key factors that went into developing replicator districts were having state facilitators who were especially responsive and identifying states that had monies available for "at risk" programs. A large number of the replication efforts were directed toward state facilitators who expressed initial interest during the course of the year.

C.A.S. staff determined the adequacy of resources by means of an "Implementation Plan" which interested districts completed and signed. The plan specified the amount of money, the personnel, and the materials to be committed to the replication efforts. A signed Implementation Plan was considered a contract to replicate. Fifteen such agreements were signed in 1988-89. In 1987-88, twelve agreements were signed; in 1986-87 there were 8. In the first year of funding, 1985-86, 6 districts made agreements. Replicators now include 10 states: Alaska,

California, Georgia, Hawaii, Maine, Maine, Maryland, New Jersey, North Carolina, Vermont, and Virginia, plus the District of Columbia. C.A.S. anticipates the future possibility of replication agreements in Illinois and Florida. The possibility of additional replicators in New York State is also being explored.

Since City-as-School is validated by J.D.R.P. as a model for all districts with secondary schools, the selection criteria could not exclude districts by using such considerations as district size, pupil performance, dropout rates, socioeconomics, or demographics as qualifying factors.

TRAINING

Project staff held three-day on-site training sessions for the 15 sites that signed Implementation Agreements. Training of sites is usually conducted within six months of their identification as replicators. However, the actual number of training sessions held was only nine, because this year, C.A.S./N.D.N. attempted to train more than one group at a site, especially in California. This unanticipated development in the continuing evolution of the project was thought to be a good thing by the director.

A large percentage of the training time involved helping replicator districts develop curriculum which utilizes local community resources and connects the school system with those resources. The director reported that C.A.S./N.D.N. staff were more involved than in previous years in interfacing with local

businesses in and around replicating sites so as to better explore these connections during training sessions. Sites are also expected to identify potential resources, businesses, social service agencies, local public offices, etc. that they think could be developed into Learning Experience Activity Packages (LEAPs), prior to the three-day training.

The training utilized a structured curriculum. Materials developed by the project staff, such as the comprehension demonstration manual were used to insure uniformity despite the use of different trainers. The agenda of each three-day session was also strongly influenced by the community resources developed by the individual site. Three folders were handed out to site representatives covering the areas of admissions, guidance, and curriculum. The C.A.S./N.D.N. director reported that training always included a tour of the school area and surrounding community, some contact with business people and local elected officials, an emphasis on the writing of curriculum for external sites (LEAPs), and actual site and resource development. Sessions were generally structured in the following manner:

- Day I- General Introduction, development of resources. Local site staff took the C.A.S. resource coordinator/ trainer on tour of the local community. The resource coordinator subsequently worked with the replication site staff to identify the methods by which community resources can be developed into LEAPs. The C.A.S./N.D.N. trainer helped the team determine the best ways to utilize the unique qualities of the community to benefit the school program. The resource coordinator then assisted the district implementors in developing stronger and more formal links with local businesses, public officials, and community agencies.

- Day II- Resource coordinator and site staff took a tour of the potential school site and discussed the manner in which the physical plant could best be utilized. Administrative concerns that the district replicators had were then addressed and discussed by the C.A.S./N.D.N. trainer. During the afternoon session school staff were asked to write a LEAP on their own that would be appropriate to the resources they had developed in their community. The day ended with a discussion of teacher roles, seminar development, and in-school instructional responsibilities.

- Day III- Morning--general question and answer session covering everything that had gone on until then. Discussion tended to focus on "nuts and bolts" details necessary for successful implementation. Site staff then developed another LEAP proposal. The afternoon session dealt with guidance and support services and their role in replicating the C.A.S. model. The trainer made a formal presentation on this subject followed by a general discussion with questions and answers. The day ended with the school replicators writing their fourth and final LEAP and an overall evaluation of the training.

C.A.S. staff worked with replicators and potential replicators during the 1988-89 school year to encourage them to explore ways of developing a relationship with a college and, if possible, to utilize campus space for the program if it was available. The director stated that such a relationship establishes a separate site identity for the school, and encourages students to take college level courses for credit. This is discussed in more detail in the next chapter of this report.

III. PROGRAM CHANGES FOR 1988-89

Several changes were proposed for C.A.S./N.D.N. in 1988-89. They were developed to offer a more effective and comprehensive view of C.A.S. and to enhance the project's efficiency. The project also sought to begin to generate income so that it would be able to establish revenue of its own.

A MORE REALISTIC CONCEPT OF C.A.S.

One change that occurred in 1988-89 was to offer a more realistic concept of C.A.S. With the input of selected sites, C.A.S. is trying to establish methods that meaningfully convey the effectiveness of the C.A.S. model. To start, a newsletter has been developed which includes: reports on new replication sites, awareness sessions being conducted in different states, and news of "goings-on" at different sites. The newsletter invites comments from all the national replications. C.A.S/N.D.N. is also calling states nationwide in order to receive copies of their different LEAPs. For next year, the plan is to publish LEAPs from all over the country.

C.A.S. is also looking to find a method to create a more realistic concept of impact evaluation data. Changed behavior, particularly as expressed in increased credits earned towards a diploma and in increased numbers of days of attendance should be the appropriate focus. According to the director, there was indeed an increase of credits earned and number of days attended in 1988-89.

C.A.S. AS A POTENTIAL COMPREHENSIVE HIGH SCHOOL

In 1988-89, C.A.S./N.D.N. wanted to more prominently feature the possibility of comprehensiveness at awareness sessions, thus making the C.A.S. model more than an alternative. This is particularly appealing where increased state requirements are constraining more conventional schools in their quest to retain the at-risk student.

C.A.S. sought to lend itself to more students by giving them more individual attention. Guidance has increasingly become a big part of this process. Beside providing counseling the program now also gives college counseling. In addition, courses are being offered by the guidance staff, like "Is There Life After C.A.S.?", whose purpose is to address students' questions about whether to work or go to college. Another course is offered to teach students the techniques of peer counseling, so that they may guide each other. C.A.S. also has a full-time social worker, who gives students appropriate referrals according to their individual needs.

To further appeal to a wide range of students, C.A.S. has a "concurrent enrollment option." This means that C.A.S. has developed links with colleges that have agreed to let students enroll in courses while still attending high school. Students attend twice a week for 1.5 hours; teachers who are called advisors offer their expertise. Teachers also provide in-house classes that are more individualized in their approach.

REVISED ROLE AND FUNCTION OF STAFF

Unanticipated at first, it is now clear that there is a strong impact on improved educational offerings from the revised role and function of the staff. Curriculum, teaching, and cooperative development of the school, as embodied in the C.A.S. model, are now being perceived as vital, contemporary and unifying elements. They all combined in the effort to educate students in search of reconnection to the world of learning and the world of adults.

According to the project director, teachers are writing new curriculum that is more contemporary, and they're excited over the concept of teaching as embodied in the C.A.S. model. There is also an exchange of professional expertise, which has helped to unify them to a team. Staff has a general feeling of rejuvination and a renewed enthusiasm. This seems to parallel what is happening to the students.

GENERATING INCOME

Another proposed change for 1988-89 was that the project should begin to generate income. Beginning January, 1988, the New York City Board of Education established an account to receive such income. The charge for the three-day in-service training is a negotiable $1,500 or: Training fee, up to $900; transportation up to $500, lodging, up to $210; meals, up to $75; and, materials, up to $100. Such income is returned to the account entitled "C.A.S./N.D.N. Project/N.Y.C. Board of Education." According to the director, the project has started

to generate income. This year, all the replicating sites paid something--some the whole fee, others a considerable portion.

C.A.S./N.D.N. is looking for additional ways to increase the project's future income. One idea is to sell the demonstration manual nationwide to interested sites.

IV. OUTCOMES

SELECTING NEW SITES FOR REPLICATION

C.A.S. categorizes a signed Implementation Plan as the completed selection of a district. Fifteen districts signed Implementation Plans in 1988-89 and will begin their replication activities during the 1989-90 school year. These additional districts bring to 41 the total number formally selected during the four years of the project. Two districts have deferred implementation because of their inability to commit the necessary resources to the program.

Although they have been able to develop a significant number of new replicating sites over the past four years, C.A.S./N.D.N. staff have had some difficulty in disseminating the model in as many different geographic areas as they would have liked. Because they were heavily dependent on receptive state facilitators and money available for dropout prevention programs, the vast majority of the new replicating sites in 1988-89 were concentrated in California, although two additional states, Maryland and Vermont did sign Implementation Agreements, as well.

Thus, the program objective of expanding the number of nation-wide C.A.S. replicators by twelve districts was exceeded. Fifteen new districts signed agreements to replicate, still a continued effort to develop adopters in new states is necessary.

SPECIAL ATTENTION TO AT-RISK STUDENTS

One of the key factors in developing replicator districts is

identifying states that have monies for at-risk programs. As previously mentioned, C.A.S. usually attracts students whose needs and learning styles have not been satisfied by traditional high schools. A majority of incoming students have been truants, dropouts, or "at-risk" of dropping out.

Because of these facts, the focus has been, and will continue to be on at-risk students, according to the project director. The special curriculum continues to link students to various out-of-school learning experiences, providing them with opportunities they might not have had otherwise. Therefore, the objective of including special references to at risk students at the replications has been met.

MATERIALS TO AID IN-SERVICE TRAINING

Last year and this year, a comprehensive training manual was developed by the director, in tandem with a former C.A.S. staff member. It is being used to provide technical assistance to replicating sites. The N.D.N. project also uses the contents of this manual for assistance in training sessions as well as for monitoring site visits. It addresses the areas that the director stated have been raised most often during training sessions and in follow-up phone calls: admissions, student advising, guidance services, curriculum development, LEAPs, computer services, and state education requirements. C.A.S. uses its own model for examples of methods by which the various areas should be developed and implemented. Also included are 2 LEAPs from

California, in an effort to give even more examples of external learning experience.

Because of the development of the demonstration manual, the objective to develop materials to aid in effective in-service training has been met.

MONITORING SITE VISITS AND FOLLOW-UP SUPPORT

Because of time, budgetary constraints, and the limited number of staff available, C.A.S. was unable to visit each of the first, second and third-year implementors. In all seven such visits were made. Team members were, however, able to monitor the progress of many of the replicator sites through statewide regional N.D.N. and alternative school conferences. Staff attempted to use travel time efficiently by combining monitoring site visits with training of new replicators whenever possible.

The director reported that C.A.S. initiated more follow-up phone calls this year to replicators and also attempted to develop a network among adopting sites by putting them in touch with each other for mutual problem-solving purposes. When C.A.S. conducts monitoring and follow-up, the areas explored most thoroughly were each site's progress in formulating LEAPs and the process they have developed to monitor student attendance in field-sites. The director indicated that when schools have difficulties identifying new field-site resources they frequently fall back on too many in-house classes and thereby undercut the effectiveness of the C.A.S. model. Follow-up support consisted of helping them develop new ideas for LEAPs as a more viable

alternative. Therefore, the follow-up support objective was addressed informally although not completely met.

TURN-KEY TRAINING

Last year, C.A.S./N.D.N. sought to conduct monitoring site visits to all districts that began replication efforts in 1985-86 and 1986-87. The intent was to assist staff at these sites to become turn-key trainers, who themselves would train additional districts as replicators. The turn-key training objective was not met in 1987-88. According to the director, C.A.S.'s broad focus and three-day-long training was too complex for new staff members to be able to successfully implement after only limited experience with the model. She also noted that it was highly unlikely that most administrators would allow staff in their districts to take the necessary days off that turn-key training would require.

An alternative plan proposed by C.A.S. was to have staff members of replicating sites conduct awareness sessions rather than training sessions. The rationale was that awareness sessions require far less time and are less difficult to learn for any potential presenter. This year, the California State Facilatator held an awareness session workshop on the implementation of C.A.S. for 15 potential replicators. Three other replicator staff members have been targeted for 1989-90 to present information at awareness sessions.

Thus, the scaled-down version of turn-key training has been partially met, but at this time has not been fully met.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

During the project's four years of operation, Implemen-tation Plans for 41 districts were signed as a result of C.A.S. awareness activities. Fifteen of those were signed this year. Staff training was conducted for all of the replicating sites, with special attention given to at-risk students.

A comprehensive training manual was put into full use this year. It provides technical and systematic assistance to replicate sites. As a result, disseminators should have a clearer understanding of the C.A.S. model. The N.D.N. project uses the contents of this training manual for assistance in training sessions as well as for monitoring replicator site visits.

The objectives that the project only partially met, were due largely to the limitations of time and resources, as was the case with monitoring site visits and follow-up support, and even a scaled-down version of turn-key training.

Fourth-year activities reflected a continually increasing knowledge of the needs and priorities of the project. A more effective and comprehensive view of C.A.S. has been developed, and the project is beginning to generate income of its own. The overall geographic balance grew this year, but the C.A.S. model still needs to be disseminated to more states. Outreach efforts directed toward developing replication sites in lower income urban areas should also be continued.

C.A.S. has utilized the resources of the National Diffusion Network by working directly through state facilitators. As a result, the C.A.S. model has become more thoroughly disseminated and established in the nationwide educational community. Increased positive responses from new school districts reflect a growing understanding of the goals and purposes of the program.

The following additional recommendations are offered for future project operations:

- C.A.S. should attempt to develop a monitoring plan for assessing the progress of all current replicators. Team members should specifically identify strengths and weaknesses of dissemination efforts in each school and make the results public and accessible.
- C.A.S. needs to find a method and create a form that more meaningfully conveys its effectiveness. Changed behavior, particularly as expressed in increased credits earned toward a diploma and in increased number of days of attendance may be the appropriate focus.
- C.A.S. should continue efforts to make a larger number of states and a higher number of inner-city school districts priorities in efforts to develop new disseminators; they should also continue to look at the potential of private schools as well.
- C.A.S. needs to look more sharply at ways to attract students in the ninth and tenth grade.
- As was done this year, C.A.S. should continue to update the program to offer a more effective and comprehensive view of itself, and to enhance its efficiency. C.A.S. should also continue to think of new ways to generate its own income.

END

U.S. Dept. of Education

Office of Education
Research and
Improvement (OERI)

ERIC

Date Filmed

March 21,1991